

REMARKS

This is in response to the Final Office Action dated December 5, 2008. In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 14-19, and 21-23 were pending and rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 7, and 15 amended; claims 6, 14, and 21-23 are canceled; and new claims 26-36 are presented.

Section Four of the Office Action indicated that independent claim 7 was objected to due to an alleged informality with respect to “the pronunciation” requiring antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully submit that with the amendment of independent claim 7 that the alleged informality has been remedied. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to independent claim 7, and to claims 14-19 and 21-23 may now be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the amendments and new claims provided herein have ample support in the specification and do not constitute new matter. Specifically, the amendments to independent claims 1 and 7 are supported, at least, by page 21, lines 21-24 and page 7, lines 16-25. Amendments to claims 3 and 4 are supported, at least, on page 7, lines 14029. New claim 27 is supported, at least, on page 23, lines 8-12. New claims 28 is supported, at least, on page 23, line 9. New claim 29 is supported, at least, on page 23 at line 9. Claim 30 is supported, at least, on page 22, lines 20-23. Claim 31 is supported, at least, by page 23, lines 5-8. Claim 32 is supported, at least, by page 23, lines 1-4. Claim 33 is supported, at least, by page 23, line 28. Claim 34 is supported, at least, by page 23, line 29. Claim 35 is supported, at least, by page 21, line 15. Claim 36 is supported, at least, by page 21, line 15.

Section Seven of the Office Action indicated that independent claims 1 and 7, among others, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Nassiff et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,410 – hereinafter “Nassiff”) in view of Hon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,852,801 – hereinafter “Hon”).

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicants have amended that claim to recite selectively changing an HMM parameter. This is an acoustic change that is supported by the specification as set forth above. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Hon nor Nassif teach

or suggest such changing of an HMM parameter selectively as set forth in amended independent claim 1. Additionally, Applicants respectfully note that dependent claims 3 and 4 have been significantly amended. Claim 3 now recites that the HMM parameter is an output probability. Applicants respectfully submit that such probability is neither taught nor suggested by Nassiff or Hon. Additionally, claim 4 recites that the HMM parameter is a transition probability. Similarly, Applicants respectfully submit that this probability is neither taught nor suggested as being selectively changed in the manner of amended claim 1 based upon Hon or Nassiff, taken alone or in combination.

With respect to independent claim 7, Applicants have amended that claim to recite selectively changing an HMM parameter if the corrected word exists in the user's lexicon and the change is inferred to be a correction. Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 7 is allowable over Nassiff and Hon for the same reason set forth above with respect to amended independent claim 1.

Applicants respectfully note that the Hon reference cited by the Office Action (column 2, lines 30-36) provides, "The present invention utilizes language model adaptation to increase the chance to recognize the same word in the future. The present invention increases the unigram probability of an unrecognized word in proportion to the difference of the score of the unrecognized word and the score of the top one word in order to increase the probability of recognizing that word in the future." While Applicants have urged the distinction between a change to a probability associated with a pronunciation and the language model adaptation of Hon in previous responses, Applicants respectfully note that amended independent claims 1 and 7 now quite specifically set forth an HMM parameter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully believe that the fundamental difference in these two quantities now distinguishes amended independent claims 1 and 7 from the hypothetical combination of Hon and Nassiff. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 1 and 7 are now in condition for allowance.

With this Amendment, Applicants respectfully submit new claim 26 which is similar to canceled dependent claims 22 and 23. Applicants respectfully note that the subject matter of canceled dependent claims 22 and 23 was indicated, in Section Nine of the Final Office action, as allegedly being unpatentable over Nassiff in view of Hon and further in view of Hoffmann et al. (U.S. Pat. Publ. No. 2003/0139922 – hereinafter “Hoffmann”). Applicants respectfully submit that Hoffmann does not teach or suggest adding at least one word pair to a user’s lexicon temporarily. Applicants respectfully note that the Office Action refers to paragraph 0015 of Hoffmann. However, that paragraph appears to provide two things. First, new words or templates can be added to the vocabulary as a function of the time and/or frequency of their occurrence at the text input interface. Accordingly, as a user frequently enters the text of an out of vocabulary word, the out of vocabulary word can eventually be added to the vocabulary. Paragraph 0015 also indicates that the hardware and software can perform continuous updating of the vocabulary according to the FIFO principle. In this manner, vocabulary words which have not been used for a long time can be eliminated. Paragraph 0015 is in the context of a mobile device that is specifically tailored for creating short messages for a telecommunications terminal. Exemplary vocabulary size is indicated in paragraph 0009 as one thousand words. There is no indication in paragraph 0015 nor the entire Hoffman teaching that words added to vocabulary are done so temporarily. In fact, it appears that words added to the vocabulary would be words that are used frequently. Since those words are used frequently, they would not be discarded according to the FIFO principle listed in paragraph 0015. Accordingly, Hoffmann cannot be considered to teach or suggest temporarily adding word pairs to a user’s lexicon. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that new claim 26 is allowable over Hon, Nassiff, and Hoffmann, taken alone or in combination.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 1 and 7 and new independent claim 26 are allowable over the art of record. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 3, 4, 15-19, and 27-36 are allowable as well by virtue of their dependency, either directly or indirectly, from allowable independent claims. Therefore,

Applicants respectfully submit that entire application is in condition for allowance.
Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or
credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Christopher R. Christenson, Reg. No. 42,413
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

CRC:lah